

classes in which students can earn college credit by passing rigorous tests.

As a result of an outstanding teaching staff, a demanding curriculum, a concerned community and a hardworking student body, Fairfax has just earned its second straight seven year accreditation, an honor given to only the strongest academic schools.

FAIRFAX HIGH SCHOOL OPENS ITS DOORS

In 1924, Fairfax High School, named for Lord Fairfax of Colonial America, opened its doors. 38,000 loads of dirt were brought in to raise (by 12 inches) the land to the Melrose frontage.

Rae G. Van Cleve, the first principal, wished to make Fairfax very "American and democratic." The Fairfax family in Virginia was contacted. They were direct descendants of Lord Fairfax. Permission was granted to use the coat of arms (Rampant Lion) and the motto "Fare Fac" ("Say and Do"). The student body chose the name "Colonials." The first boys' and girls' groups were called Lords and Ladies. The Lord High Commissioner was the student body president.

The auditorium was dedicated in 1926 and later was named the DeWitt Swan Auditorium in honor of the first boys' vice principal. The first annual in 1926 contained the dedication, "Enter to learn; go forth to serve." In 1927, the summer class dedicated the sunken gardens and the fountain that was located in front of the old building. The same year a fine arts building and a gymnasium were added to the campus. By this time, Fairfax High School (containing grades 7-12) was an established prestigious element of the Fairfax community.

New bleachers were dedicated in 1933. Mr. Van Cleve retired in 1938, and the Rotunda, complete with a statue of Abraham Lincoln, was dedicated. In 1942, Greenway Court, the Fairfax social hall, named after Lord Fairfax's Court in Virginia, was dedicated. The Senior Court, called Dettler Court, was dedicated in 1947. Van Cleve Field was dedicated the next year.

In 1932, all Los Angeles was focusing on the upcoming Olympic Games, so graduation was held at the Greek Theater in Griffith Park.

EARTHQUAKES IMPACT FAIRFAX CAMPUS

Because Fairfax was not earthquake-safe, 1966 was the last year of the original campus. That year, brick by brick, the old structure came down and a completely new building arose. Students and faculty moved into the new building in 1968. Because of the unique beauty of the Rotunda and the Auditorium, a public campaign was successful in saving them and the auditorium was reinforced to assure earthquake safety.

The earthquake of 1971 crippled the facilities of Los Angeles High School; and, as a result, Fairfax students attended school only in the morning; Los Angeles students used the campus in the afternoon. One semester Los Angeles High School students moved back to their own campus.

Currently, again for earthquake safety, the northern football bleachers are being demolished. They will be replaced and, perhaps, lights will be erected on the field.

The academic tradition and excellence in extracurricular activities represented by the 35,000 graduates of Fairfax is continuing today as evidenced by the following:

Eighty percent of the graduating seniors are going on to higher education; 40 percent to 4 year schools.

Fairfax has the 4th highest stability rate among the 49 Los Angeles High Schools

with 74 percent of the graduates spending all three years at Fairfax.

The Academic Decathlon team finished 5th in the City and had the highest individual scorer.

Eighty-six seniors have earned a Presidential Academic Fitness Award for maintaining at least a B+ average.

Drama hosted a festival for 61 Southern California schools and won the 5th place sweepstakes trophy.

Our seniors are being accepted at prestigious universities everywhere—three at Harvard, others at Brown, Georgetown, Cal Tech, Stanford, Berkeley, Chicago, UCLA, Smith, Bryn Mawr, Cornell and even the Sorbonne in Paris.

Students from Fairfax had more paintings and drawings exhibited at a recent Otis Art Institute show than any other school in greater Los Angeles. One of our art teachers is being flown to New York to judge a national art competition, the only judge west of the Mississippi.

An Anaheim convention voted the Fairfax annual the most improved in Southern California.

The new speech team has won numerous medals, trophies and cash; three students qualified for and went to the state tournament.

Fairfax grads attending UCLA maintain a dramatically higher grade point average compared with their high school GPA than the bulk of the other schools in Southern California.

SUCCESS IS A FUNCTION OF COOPERATION AND STABILITY

The success of Fairfax students is a function of cooperation and stability of students, parents/community and a dedicated staff. The Community Advisory Council, presided over by Dr. Arnold Gurevitch, parent, has had an average attendance of 80 at each of its meetings. There is a free, cooperative exchange at the meetings. Attention of students, parents and staff is focused in important instructional issues.

The stability and longevity of staff is best illustrated by two teachers—Doris Siddall, former science teacher who will celebrate her 92nd birthday on June 4, 1984, and Humer Hummel, currently a math/scholar music teacher at Fairfax. Ms. Siddall was one of the original staff of Fairfax in 1924 and retired in 1957. Mr. Hummel has been teaching at Fairfax for 34 years. Another Fairfax veteran is student government sponsor George Zografos. Mr. Zografos says, "An actively involved, democratic student government is a vital ingredient in an effective school." For a quarter of a century he has been espousing this philosophy.

Under the guidance of Mr. Christian Strohmeier, the PTSA has continued to provide badly needed services to students, from providing shoes for students to paying for advanced placement examinations to serving refreshments at athletic events.

Principals at Fairfax have been: Rae Van Cleve, 1924-39; Ralph Dettler, 1939-45; William Goodwin, 1945-57; Samuel Oelrich, 1957-65; James Tunney, 1965-71; Richard Miller, 1971-72; William Layne, 1972-77; Edward Cheetham, 1977-83; Warren Steinberg, 1983.

Current assistant principals are Gertrude Dorsey and Milford James, head counselor Camille Carter, administrative dean Robert Steinhauer. Avik Gilboa is the faculty representative.

The new Fairfax High School Hall of Fame and the success of its inductees reaf-

firm the 1926 dedication, "Enter to learn, go forth to serve." ●

PENINSULA HUMANE SOCIETY STATEMENT ON ANIMAL PROTECTION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the Peninsula Humane Society, a nonprofit animal welfare organization serving San Mateo County, has presented testimony to the Democratic Platform Committee on the subject of animal protection. The testimony was submitted by Richard Ward, executive director of the society.

The issues raised in the society's statement are important ones, and I ask that they be included in the RECORD. For those of us who are concerned with animal welfare—and this should include all of us in the House—this thoughtful statement deserves our attention and our action.

TESTIMONY TO THE 1984 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL RIGHTS

The animal welfare movement has grown in numbers and sophistication in the past decade. The Peninsula Humane Society is in the forefront of this movement. In the past, humane societies focused only on pet care. Now, we have broadened our scope and are addressing all animal protection issues; we have progressed from concerning ourselves with animal welfare to animal rights. In so doing we have become more politically oriented, campaigning for changes in society that will guarantee better treatment for animals.

Some of the issues the animal rights and protection movements are concerned about include:

(a) Factory farming is the mass production of farm animals for food by crowding a large number of chickens, pigs or other animals into small spaces so they can be managed in a cost-saving way. Billions of livestock and poultry are raised in total confinement and slaughtered after a short, miserable life. Many of our farm animals never see the light of day, don't have the freedom to graze, and rarely have the opportunity to interact with others of their own species.

(b) The care our domestic pets receive must also be addressed. Animal shelters kill approximately 18 million dogs and cats a year because we cannot find homes for them. The pet overpopulation problem is getting worse, despite low-cost spay and neuter clinics and humane education programs. It is deplorable to kill so many healthy dogs, puppies, cats, and kittens simply because people are not properly caring for or sterilizing their pets.

(c) Sixty to 80 million research animals die in laboratories annually in our country. Four billion tax dollars is spent each year on animal experimentation. Many of the experiments animals are used for are unnecessary and repetitive. We are not calling for a complete halt to animal research, but we are demanding that research animals be provided with better housing, pre- and post-surgical care, and pain relieving drugs. In

addition, we want an information service developed to prevent unintended duplication and to provide information on alternatives to animal experimentation. Furthermore, each research institution utilizing animals should have representatives from animal rights organizations on their animal care committees to represent community concerns for the welfare of the living subjects.

We must change the status of animals in our society. In order to accomplish this it is important that we strengthen the laws protecting animals and introduce more legislation to stop the injustices many animals suffer. Ideally, a day will come when our laws will reflect ethical values.

The minimum right that all animals should possess is the right not to suffer needlessly. We have not even given this basic right to the animals. At the very least, all animals should be guaranteed humane care and treatment.

The Democratic Party has championed the unfortunate, the downtrodden, the unrepresented. We challenge the Democratic Party to extend their concern to their most silent constituency—the animals. They cannot speak in their own defense; we must accept this responsibility. ●

U.S. ANTISATELLITE PLAN DRAWS FIRE

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1984

● **Mr. BERMAN.** Mr. Speaker, as the debate on the Department of Defense authorization continues, I wanted to enter into the record the opinion of the NATO defense ministers on U.S. plans for war in space. Our NATO allies join many of us in this House in concern and dismay about proposed antisatellite weapons testing and development. I urge my colleagues to read the following article from the Washington Post of last month:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 1984]

**U.S. ANTISATELLITE PLAN DRAWS FIRE:
NATO MINISTERS REPORTEDLY EXPRESS
SKEPTICISM, ANXIETY**

(By Fred Hiatt)

CESME, TURKEY, April 3.—NATO defense ministers meeting here today expressed skepticism and nervousness about U.S. plans to prepare for war in space, according to officials from several countries.

The ministers listened politely as Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger explained his administration's plans to develop a comprehensive space-based missile defense and defended its decision not to seek a treaty with the Soviet Union banning antisatellite weapons. After the session, which U.S. officials had predicted would be "harmonious," several allied ministers indicated they were not altogether reassured.

"My impression is the Europeans were broadly united in their critical questions," West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner said, referring to what the Reagan administration calls its "strategic defense initiative." He added: "I can't see that it would provide greater protection or stability. I can only hope it would give an incentive for arms control."

Woerner's comments were echoed by other ministers as a meeting that was supposed to be calm and almost celebratory took place amid some uneasiness. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Nuclear Planning Group is meeting for the first time since beginning deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe.

But with U.S.-Soviet talks on arms control broken off, and the Dutch wavering in their commitment to deploy the missiles, the ministers found that the contentious issue was not behind them. The NATO allies fear that a Dutch decision not to accept its 48 nuclear-armed cruise missiles would invigorate peace movements in the other nations that have agreed to field the medium-range missiles: West Germany, Britain, Italy and Belgium.

Dutch Defense Minister Jacob de Ruiter acknowledged that his colleagues urge him in "a loud and clear chorus" to accept the missiles. But he responded that he could make no commitment until his parliament votes in May or June.

Much of the session, taking place in a hotel overlooking the Aegean Sea in this Turkish resort, was consumed by Weinberger and other U.S. officials explaining their space program and allowing European ministers to raise questions about it.

Weinberger assured the allies, according to a U.S. official who asked not to be identified, that the missile defense program will remain in a research phase for several years, that the allies will be consulted at every step, and that European security will not be sacrificed.

"There was, as there has been before, concern about whether the coverage of a strategic defense system would extend to and protect Europe as well as the United States, to which Secretary Weinberger gave an unequivocal affirmative answer," the U.S. official said, "I believe that the ministers were reassured by the secretary's very clear answer."

De Ruiter agreed that no one had urged the United States to suspend its research effort, especially in the face of a vigorous description of what U.S. officials said is an active Soviet program to develop missile defense, but de Ruiter said it remains "a discussion full of question marks. It has many aspects that can worry us."

The Europeans said they worry that a missile defense system protecting the United States might leave Europe vulnerable. They also raised the issue of a "possible danger of a defensive arms race," as Woerner said, that would be costly to them and destabilizing to U.S.-Soviet relations.

Several allies have urged U.S. officials to enter into negotiations with the Soviets to ban such weapons in order to forestall an arms race in space and U.S. reluctance to do so could fuel European concern about lack of progress in arms talks in general.

Officials said Woerner and de Ruiter both noted, however, that Weinberger had ruled out a total ban on such weapons, which the Soviets have developed and the United States is now testing, but said some partial controls might be possible. ●

THANKING MEXICO

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1984

● **Mr. COLEMAN** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid yesterday underscored the need to focus national attention on the issues involving our neighbor and ally to the immediate south. An article today in the Washington Post underscores the vital role that our ally has played in dealing with the regional turmoil in Central America as well as managing successfully its foreign debt. As the noted columnist Joseph Kraft points out.

Finally, if only because Washington has so thoroughly botched the matter with such heavy costs to this country's good name, there is a strong case for handing off Central America and its problems to the enlightened leader of Mexico. Certainly the administration has offered nothing nearly as sensible as the proposals advanced by Mexico and the other members of the so-called Contadora group for a negotiated settlement.

The article follows:

THANKING MEXICO

(By Joseph Kraft)

The global economy is so much of a piece that a basic defect can manifest itself in many different kinds of aches and pains. The immediate sore spot, we are reminded by the visit of President Miguel de la Madrid, is Third World debt.

But largely because of the Mexican president's political courage and economic sobriety, the debt problem is proving to be manageable. So it makes sense for the Reagan administration to shower kindnesses on de la Madrid, especially in the touchy matter of Central America.

Record American budget deficits of \$200 billion for the foreseeable future constitute the underlying vulnerability in the world economy. The Treasury has to borrow to pay the debt. Since January there has also been brisk demand for loans from the private sector. The competition has caused interest rates to soar. In the past two months the prime rate which banks charge their best customers has climbed from 11 to 12.5 percent—a staggering rise that could yield many adverse consequences.

Recession for one. If the Federal Reserve Board moved dramatically to tighten credit, interest rates would shoot still higher. Corporate and consumer borrowing would shut down, bringing the economy to a screeching halt. But the Fed has moved gently, not in abrupt fashion. All kinds of indicators—including good retail sales for April—show that the recovery continues apace. Those administration officials who have recently been attacking the Fed for tight money only prove they don't comprehend what has been happening.

Inflation is a second awful possibility. The economy has been growing to the point where some goods and some skilled labor are becoming scarce. The experience of the last 15 years makes people wary of inflation anyhow. The huge deficits feed that wariness. If the Fed printed more money to accommodate loan demand, an inflationary